

ARRIVAL OF THE ASIA.

ADDITIONAL NEWS FROM EUROPE.

The *Great Eastern* and the death of her designer.

THE BRITISH DEFEAT IN CHINA.

The *Onward* steamship Asia, Capt. Lill, which sailed from Liverpool at about 11 A. M. on the 17th of September, arrived at this port about eleven o'clock last night.

The news by the Asia is two days later than that received by the City of Baltimore and Vanderbilt, but has been anticipated by the arrival of the *Crossian*, from Galway 17th inst., at St. John, N. F., on Tuesday last. A synopsis of the news was published on Wednesday's Herald.

The *London Daily News* states that the government have decided on despatching several additional steam frigates and corvettes, together with a sufficient number of sailing frigates, to augment the squadron in China. It is also expected that a force of 1,000 additional marines will be despatched to China.

The *London Daily News* says there are about 5,000 rather wrong headed soldiers in the vicinity of Calcutta, waiting a passage home, and the object should be to divert them from the West to the East. Assuming, however, their reticence impracticable, there is still in India a force large enough to overcome even the mighty Chinese empire.

The *London Daily News* announces that government have resolved to send at once a military force to China, and to send it from India.

The *Red Sea* and *India Telegraph* Company have announced the arrangements under which they will be prepared, on and after the 1st of October, to transmit messages for the public between Alexandria and Aden. Messages for Australia and China will be forwarded by direct communication with Alexandria that will be established through Constantinople in the course of a few weeks.

The news from India will reach London in ten or twelve days. The cable for the Kurrum section, in course of shipment at Burkenhead, will be laid by the end of the year.

Conflicting accounts are published as to the state of the London builders' strike, but it is evident that great numbers of men are resuming work under the non-society terms proposed by the masters.

Messrs. D. Bell, Son & Co. report as follows:—During the past week the market for American securities has continued active. The various State stocks have been in good demand, with but very limited amounts offered for sale, while the chief business has been in United States five per cent bonds, redeemable in 1874, which have been freely dealt in at improved prices. In railroad securities there is but little doing, and quotations are without change.

United States 5 per cent bonds, 1868.....	96 1/8
Do. 5 per cent bonds, 1871.....	95 3/4
Alabama 6 per cent bonds, 1868.....	71 1/2
Kentucky 6 per cent bonds, 1868-72.....	92 1/4
Maryland 5 per cent bonds, 1868.....	94 1/2
Mississippi 6 per cent bonds, 1868.....	88 1/2
Ohio 5 per cent bonds, 1868.....	96 1/2
Pennsylvania 6 per cent bonds, 1868.....	94 1/2
Do. 5 per cent bonds, 1871.....	93 1/2
South Carolina 5 per cent bonds, 1868.....	85 1/2
Tennessee 6 per cent bonds, 1868.....	81 1/2
Virginia 6 per cent bonds, 1868.....	84 1/2
Boston 4 1/2 per cent bonds, 1868.....	89 1/2
Do. 5 per cent bonds, 1868.....	90 1/2
Do. 5 per cent bonds, 1871.....	89 1/2
Do. 6 per cent bonds, 1871.....	76 1/2
Do. 7 per cent bonds, 1868.....	83 1/2
Michigan Central 6 per cent, 1869.....	80 1/2
Do. do. shares.....	33 1/2
New York Central 6 per cent, 1868.....	82 1/2
Do. do. shares.....	34 1/2
Do. 7 per cent bonds, 1868.....	94 1/2
Do. do. shares.....	68 1/2
New York Erie 7 per cent, 3d mtg., 1868.....	62 1/2
Pennsylvania 6 per cent, 1st mtg., 1868.....	90 1/2
Pennsylvania Central 6 per cent, 1st mtg., 1868.....	88 1/2

The *London Times* of Friday quotes sales Illinois Central shares at 38 1/2.

The steamer Bremen, from New York, arrived at Southampton on the 16th inst.

THE GREAT EASTERN.

It is officially announced that the *Great Eastern* will leave Portland, Weymouth, on her trial trip, on the 8th of October, instead of the 17th September, and finally sail from Holyhead for Portland, Maine, on the 20th of October, instead of the 29th September. This delay of three weeks is the time in which Mr. Scott Russell contrives to repair the damage occasioned by the explosion, and to put the vessel in the same condition that she was in when she sailed from the Thames. This contract, however, does not include any repairs which the boilers may be found to require, and although they apparently sustained no damage, an investigation is said to have shown that the internal stays of the boiler most directly exposed to the force of the shock have either been displaced or greatly weakened, so that the boiler cannot be safely used in its present state.

THE DEATH OF MR. BRUNEL.

The decease of Mr. Brunel, the eminent engineer, occurred at his residence in London on the 15th instant, at the comparatively early age of fifty-four years. His last illness was the *Great Eastern*. On the 5th he was carried from the *Great Eastern* to his residence in a very dangerous and alarming condition, having been seized with paralysis, induced, it was believed, by over mental anxiety. In spite of the most skillful medical attention he continued to sink, and expired at half-past ten on Thursday night.

THE WAR IN CHINA.

The City of Baltimore and Vanderbilt brought up ample details of the disaster at the mouth of the Peiho, but the papers now to hand contain additional particulars. "An Eye-Witness," in a letter to the *London Times*, thus speaks of the attitude of the Americans:—"I cannot end without referring to one matter that, in connection with this battle, should be ever remembered. Were we children of the same mother we could not have received more sympathy and kindness than we met with from the Americans. Never were men more unwillingly neutral. As we passed in to the assault, Flag Officer Peabody was heard to say, 'I would be thicker than water,' and in a hundred different ways to all his people, to the very cabin boys, acted up to this homely proverb. When he heard that our Admiral was wounded, at great personal risk he went on board the *Cornwall* to see him. Many of our men slept in the American tents on the night of the fight. Segars, coffee, brandy—everything a man could want—was placed before them. The American crew forgot themselves, and thought only of the British.

Decision in Admiralty.

Before Hon. Judge Nelson.

Sept. 29.—*Stephen Larrabee and others vs. the Steamship Piedmont, her Tackle, &c.*—This case came up on appeal from the Judge sitting in Admiralty, on a claim for damages of \$4,452 20, for a collision under the following state of facts:—The brig *Piedmont*, owned by the libellants, was on her voyage from Jacksonville, Florida to Boston, loaded with lumber. On Sunday morning, September 2, 1855, while passing Holmes' Hole with a strong wind from S. W., took a heavy squall from the "Hole," and finding the vessel to be in danger, she was driven round to the south of the Hole, and came to anchor among a fleet of vessels lying there; the sails were clewed up, and the vessel was driven down to the main anchor. All hands were called to make sail for Boston, but the master, judging from the state of the tide that he could not do it safely, he set the usual watch and hoisted a good white light in the rigging, about 11 P. M. The watch saw the steamer *Piedmont* two miles to the eastward, and when she was within a quarter of a mile she was hailed twice, but neither light was answered, and the steamer did not stop or change her course, but came directly head on to the brig, striking her on the starboard quarter, a few feet forward of the stern, inside of her counter timber, cutting off clear her whole stern down to the main transom. Judge Nelson said:—I have looked into this case, and am satisfied that the injury done to the brig was committed by the negligence of the master of the *Piedmont*, and that the damages seem to me to have been carefully estimated, and I will award the sum of \$4,452 20.

THE CASE OF LITTLE ELIA BURNS.

CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY RESPECTING HER TREATMENT.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

THE CASE OF LITTLE ELIA BURNS.

CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY RESPECTING HER TREATMENT.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

THE CASE OF LITTLE ELIA BURNS.

CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY RESPECTING HER TREATMENT.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

THE CASE OF LITTLE ELIA BURNS.

CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY RESPECTING HER TREATMENT.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

THE BISHOP'S CONVENTION.

THE BISHOP'S CONVENTION OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.—THE CASE OF MRS. O'DONNELL.

SECOND DAY—MORNING SESSION.

The Convention resumed its session yesterday morning at nine o'clock. The proceedings commenced with the recital of morning prayers by Rev. J. L. Harrison and Rev. Minot M. Wells, rector of the church of the Holy Innocents, Cornwall, Orange county. Rev. Joshua Weaver then said the anti-union service.

It being announced that Bishop Potter would be unable to attend the opening of the session, it was moved and carried that Rev. Wm. L. Johnson take the chair. The minutes of the preceding day's business were read and adopted. Lay delegates who had not been present the day before then presented their certificates, which were submitted to the proper authority for examination.

Bishop Potter being arrived, and took the chair. The report of the Committee on the Corporation of Churches was read.

The SECRETARY moved that the churches named in the report, and which had made application for admission into the union with the Convention, receive that privilege. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Hawley moved with a report from the Committee on Canons, which was adopted. The report was in relation to changes made in articles III. and VI., and caused considerable discussion.

When the confusion attending this discussion had subsided, Bishop Potter came forward and delivered the opening address. He stated that he would waive the formal charge which preceded the address, and said that it was a subject of reflection to him that during the five years of his service in the episcopacy the church had been steadily growing. The attendance at Lent was unusually large, notwithstanding other excitements which agitated the public mind. He referred to the late financial revolution, and the attitude of the church towards it. He said that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation. He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He showed how progressive the work of the church was, and how the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

He stated that the church was not to be a source of good, for men in their affliction saw the vanity of earthly possessions, and turned to religion for consolation.

THE CASE OF LITTLE ELIA BURNS.

CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY RESPECTING HER TREATMENT.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me to give permission to the sergeant to serve the habeas corpus; he explained to me what it was for; I told him I had no objection whatever to the sergeant serving it; I gave the sergeant directions, and then Mr. Cook proposed to accompany him; to this I objected; Mr. Cook then intimated to me that he was desirous of accompanying him for the purpose of taking the child by force; in reply, I told him that if that was his object I should give no permission to Lafferty or any other officer, I informed him that it was in violation of the law, it being, in fact, kidnapping, and that I would permit no officer to assist in such a violation; Mr. Cook then took the writ and left.

Sept. 29.—*In the matter of the Habeas Corpus of Elia B. Burns.*—Deputy Superintendent Carpenter being sworn, deposed:—Mr. Cook was brought into my office by Sergeant Lafferty; he desired me